SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IV, No. 8 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | April 15, 1974

Spinoff from DoD R&D? Not Much, Study Finds

A committee working under the auspices of the National Academy of Engineering, the nation's most prestigious organization for engineers, has come close to labeling as a sham the oft-made claim that the massive amount of money which has been poured into space and defense research has resulted in widespread spinoff benefits to society.

"With a few exceptions, the vast technology developed by federally-funded programs since World War II has not resulted in widespread 'spinoffs' of secondary or additional applications of practical products, processes, and services that have made an impact on the nation's economic growth, industrial productivity, employment gains, and foreign trade," the committee states.

It goes on to note that there is a huge amount of technology developed in federal laboratories which could be exploited for the public good, but "a plethora of structural and institutional barriers exist in the federal government and the private economy to prevent the efficient and effective use of this technology."

In 1972, when the now-defunct Office of Science and Technology put together Nixon's historic message on science and technology, the talk then was of finding ways of putting R&D to work in solving "critical national problems." Nixon's message promised that the federal government would seek to find ways to stimulate private investment in R&D and to get technology which had been developed in

[Continued on page 2.

IRS Querying Travel Writeoffs

One of the more charming perquisites of the scientific life, the tax-deductible conference trip with playtime thrown in, is drawing dirty looks from the Internal Revenue Service as part of a general crackdown on questionable "business" deductions.

With conferencing an historic ingredient of the research profession, and the provision of conference services and facilities a booming and increasingly competitive business, recreational aspects have come to be loudly touted in pitches for the patronage of scientific groups.

However, according to IRS Commissioner Donald C. Alexander, who discussed the subject in a speech last month in Washington, abuses have reached the point where IRS is disallowing what amount to no more than "vacations in disguise."

Citing the case of a physician who went to a convention and then took a post-convention cruise with "professional talks" on the ship, Alexander notes that a tax court decision allowed all the costs of the convention to be deducted, but accepted only 20 percent of the cruise costs.

Deductions claimed for cruises and other holiday-type activities, an IRS press release states, will henceforth be subjected to additional scrutiny, and where doubt exists, the taxpayer will be required to provide data to substantiate the claim that the holiday setting was actually devoted to professional activity.

In Brief

With gasoline supplies nearly back to normal, Washington is beginning to show a perceptible lessening of urgency about energy-related measures. A House-passed bill to give NASA $50 million for solar demonstration projects is bogged down in jurisdictional squabbles in the Senate, and the problem is compounded by the Administration's contention—as voiced by NSF Director Stever—that the present research base is inadequate for moving on to large-scale demonstration efforts.

Fulfilling the prophecy of space-shuttle opponents who described the multi-billion venture as a gold-plated solution that will search for problems, the manager of GE's Advanced Programs Space Division, David W. Keller, has proposed that the shuttle be used for orbital manufacture of vaccines. Processing in space, he said, "may help us find a solution to the common cold. . ." Gesundheit!

To help you keep track of Washington's shifting tables of energy organizations: By Executive Order, dated March 28, the President has abolished the Energy Policy Office, which he established last June, and has assigned its remnants to the Oil Policy Committee, which is chaired by the head of the Federal Energy Office.

Meanwhile, NSF announces the creation of an Office of Energy-Related General Research as part of its Research Directorate, and also announces the establishment of "a separate program on the Environmental Effects of Energy, in RANN's (Research Applied to National Needs) Division of Environmental Systems and Resources, to determine the effects of energy resource extraction, conversion, and use on the natural environment."

OTA Gets Moving with Drug Study for Kennedy

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), which has drawn some sniping for its leisurely startup pace (SGR Vol. IV, No. 5), has decided to move along swiftly on at least one assessment and report to Congress by July 1.

The subject selected for fast treatment is "bioequivalency" of pharmaceutical drugs, which became a hot item last December when HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger recommended that in purchasing drugs, the government opt for the least expensive version "in (the) absence of demonstrated differences in uniform quality and therapeutic equivalence. . ." Weinberger's recommendation was included in testimony presented to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare subcommitttee on health, whose chairman, Edward M. Kennedy, shares the Secretary's concern about high profit margins in the pharmaceutical industry.

Weinberger said that the system of buying at lowest cost, with specified exceptions, could safely be adopted because "all the evidence to date indicates that clinically significant differences in bioavailability are not frequent."

His position, however, was challenged by representatives of the pharmaceutical industry who contended that the absence of demonstrable differences could not be taken as evidence that they did not exist. Kennedy, who is chairman of OTA's board, subsequently recommended that OTA carry out a study on the subject and report back to his subcommittee.

Since this is the first OTA study to get underway, the organizational arrangements are of some interest. OTA's first step was to start putting together an advisory panel to supervise the study. Selected to chair the panel was Robert W. Berliner, newly appointed dean of Yale Medical School, and former director for science of the National Institutes of Health. While other members are being selected, a contract for $149,000 was awarded to a Washington-based organization, Family Health Care, Inc., headed by Stanley C. Scheyer, former medical director of the Peace Corps, to carry out the study.

As stated in an OTA announcement, "The key issue to be assessed is whether present day technology can determine that two drugs with the same chemical composition but produced under different manufacturing processes will produce the same therapeutic results."

Since the value of OTA in the hurly-burly of Congressional affairs is yet to be proven, there is a good deal more riding on this study than mere determination of the particular issue at hand. If the OTA study decisively settles the matter one way or the other for Kennedy's subcommittee, due note of this will pass along the Congressional grapevine and members confronted by scientific and technical problems will be more inclined to turn to OTA for assistance.

SPINOFF *(Continued from page 1.)*

federal laboratories out into the marketplace.

But about the only federal project to emerge from the gusher of talk was the Experimental Technology Incentives Program (ETIP), jointly funded and administered by the National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards. NBS is only now getting round to announcing its first contracts, and NSF's part of the operation has been reduced from an $11 million a year enterprise to a miniscule $1 million. According to NSF Director Guyford Stever, the program is now in an "evaluation mode."

The accomplishments have therefore so far failed to live up to the rhetoric of Nixon's message, and the NAE committee—which was in fact convened through a grant from the NSF ETIP program—has suggested that so far the Administration has been taking too timid an approach.

For a start, the committee believes that the federal government has been spending a paltry sum of money encouraging technology utilization—in 1973, it spent $43 million, or 0.25 per cent of the total research budget on such activities. The NAE committee reckons that the figure should be pumped up to $1 billion.

The money would be used to fund a search of projects supported by federal agencies, to determine which have developed products likely to be useful to society, and then to fund a variety of incentives to industry to exploit them. Such incentives as exclusive licenses, and "imaginatively bold financing to users in the private and public sectors in order to accelerate the direct implementation or to stimulate financial institutions to provide greater investment in new technology enterprises" should be tried, the committee suggested.

Most of the committee's suggestions and recommendations are familiar stuff, and reflect the industrial bent of the majority of its members. Like similar recommendations made last year by representatives from state and local governments for harnessing federal R&D for the common good, they will probably be quietly forgotten.

The committee was chaired by Joseph H. Newman, senior vice president, Tishman Research Corp., New York City. The report, titled, *Technology Transfer and Utilization*, is available without charge from the Printing and Publishing Office, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, D.C. 20418.

AEC Very Quiet about Failure of Rio Blanco Test

In keeping with the tradition that government agencies trumpet their successes but keep quiet about their failures, the Atomic Energy Commission hasn't been saying much recently about Project Rio Blanco, the 90-kiloton underground nuclear explosion which was set off last year in Colorado amid a gusher of protests. However, a check with AEC officials confirms that the experiment has turned out to be less than a resounding success.

Since a technical failure could well prove fatal to the AEC's already tottering plan to set off thousands of Rio Blanco-type explosions to blast natural gas out of a layer of sandstone deep under the Rocky Mountains, the AEC's silence on the matter is not altogether surprising, particularly in view of the fact that the plan has picked up a raft of opponents to whom news of problems is akin to manna from heaven.

A hint that something went wrong with Rio Blanco is buried in the sixth paragraph of a nine-paragraph announcement put out by the AEC's Denver office, but the blandness of the announcement belies the fact that the experiment failed to meet what AEC officials had previously described as its "major objective."

Rio Blanco was the third underground nuclear explosion in a series designed to see whether nuclear weapons technology can be used to get natural gas out of "tight" rock formations where it is trapped in small isolated pockets. The idea is to blast out a cavern about a mile underground, let it fill with gas released by fractures in the surrounding rock, wait until the radioactivity has declined to an "acceptable" level, and bring it to the surface.

If the technique is ever going to be used commercially, some method must be found for fracturing a thick layer of gas-bearing rock to produce a high

(Continued on page 4.)

Head of NAS Herbicide Study Assails Kistiakowsky

The venerable National Academy of Sciences continues to reverberate with angry exchanges following successful efforts by dissident members to get a jump on the Defense Department in making public a Vietnam defoliation study that the NAS carried out under a Defense contract.

The study, which was ordered by Congress, presented a horrendous picture of the effects of defoliation and was leaked to the press (SGR Vol. IV, Nos. 5 and 6) because of fears that if initial release came from DoD, the public impact would be blunted by obfuscatory statements from the military.

Among those taking the lead in getting the report to the press before official release and in criticizing it for not being even harsher, was George B. Kistiakowsky, retired vice president of the Academy, who has long been at loggerheads with Academy President Philip Handler. While serving as vice president of the Academy—he reached the mandatory retirement age last year and was required to step down while the report was in the mill—Kistiakowsky was responsible for appointing the panel that was required to pass on the quality of the report. The panel is widely credited with forcing the study committee to bear down hard on the subject and produce a report that demolished DoD's contention that defoliation had a relatively limited ecological effect.

Following widespread press coverage of leaked versions of the report, things quieted down for a while at the Academy, but just last week, the chairman of the committee that conducted the study, Anton Lang, of Michigan State University, took out after Kistiakowsky in the letters column of the *Washington Post*.

The committee, he wrote, "operated with the understanding that the report would not be released, nor commented upon, before it was in the hands of Congress and had been released by the latter. Other members of the Academy who were given the report for review purposes were under the same obligation.

"I do not know," he continued, "how Dr. Kistiakowsky was authorized to comment on and criticize a report before it was made public. This is not the normal procedure in science, and in this case represents a clear and blatant breach of confidence. . . .

"I find it particularly regrettable that while you gave great prominence to criticism of the committee and disagreements within the latter (although they were limited to one major problem among many), you did not say one word on the constructive aspects of its report. . . .

"Reading your account of the Committee's efforts one cannot help feeling that you and Dr. Kistiakowsky were much less concerned with the meaning of the military herbicide program to Vietnam and the Vietnamese — the country and the people directly concerned and let us not forget, our allies — and with a constructive approach to the problem than with having another horror story."

With the Academy's annual meeting scheduled for the end of this month, it may be assumed that we have not heard the last of this matter.

Gifts to Education Hit Record

The widely held notion that the public is turning its back on the financial needs of higher education finds no support in figures recently released by the Council for Financial Aid to Education.

For the year ended last June 30, according to the CFAE, contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations reached a record high — $2.24 billion, an increase of 11 percent over the previous year.

The top recipients were: Harvard, $57.1 million; Stanford, $46.5 million; University of California System, $44.3 million; Yale, $32.1 million; Cornell, $30.6 million; Northwestern, $30.3 million; University of Pennsylvania, $28.9 million; University of Chicago, $28.7 million; Emory University, $27.4 million, and Columbia, $27.1 million.

Details are contained in *Voluntary Support of Education, 1972-73*, $6, to be published at the end of May. (CFAE, 680 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10019.)

Medical School Rejects Flocking Abroad

Faced with diminishing prospects for enrolling in medical schools in the United States, prospective physicians are turning in droves to schools and colleges abroad. According to a survey carried out by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 2,045 US citizens were studying medicine in Latin America and Canada in the 1971-72 academic year, and there are indications that the number has grown since then.

By far the largest home for expatriate US medical students is Mexico, where 1,744 are enrolled in the Autonomous University of Guadalajara alone, each of them paying $4,000 a year for tuition. A new medical school has also recently opened at the University of Monterrey, and the HEW survey reckons that it could soon attract as many US medical students as Guadalajara.

The chief incentive for foreign study is the fact that in 1972, US medical schools rejected 16,800 applicants, and the less restrictive admission policies in some foreign countries help create "a haven for would-be physicians who are not able to compete with other applicants meeting medical school admissions criteria more exactly."

Copies of the report, *Foreign Medical Students in the Americas*, can be obtained from the US government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price, 55 cents. Number 1741-00069.

BLAST *(Continued from page 3.)*

yield, and Rio Blanco was designed to do just that. In short, the test involved stringing three 30-kiloton explosives together in a vertical line, about 450 feet apart, in the hope that the caverns blasted out by each one would join together to form a huge underground chimney.

But when the AEC drilled into the cavern, it found that it was getting gas only from the area around the topmost explosive—the caverns either failed to join together, or they had become blocked off from each other.

IMPACT STATEMENT

This rather embarrassing discovery is going to present a huge obstacle to the nuclear gas stimulation plans because the AEC itself pointed out in an environmental impact statement two years ago that "the use of multiple explosives is required to improve both the economics and the total recoverable fraction of the gas."

But the whole notion of exploding thousands of nuclear devices under the Rockies had already run into some pretty devastating opposition long before Rio Blanco shattered the peace last year, and the handwriting was probably already on the wall.

For a start, people living in the area are not very happy about the prospect of having their homes shaken by shockwaves. But more important, the gas fields happen to lie directly beneath the highly prized oil shale fields which have been proclaimed as offering a potentially huge source of domestic petroleum. The oil companies which have been bidding for a piece of the shale lands are unlikely to sit back and allow the AEC's nuclear fantasies to jeopardize their operations. They will be only too happy to use Rio Blanco's technical problems as a club with which to beat the program into an early grave.

"NO KNOWN ALTERNATIVE"

In view of the fact that about 300 trillion cubic feet of natural gas are reckoned to be recoverable from the Rocky Mountain oil shale area, enough to satisfy the entire US demand for 10 years, neither the federal government nor the energy industry is likely to give up trying to get it out. Unfortunately, though, the AEC said in its environmental impact statement on Rio Blanco that "there is no known alternative to nuclear gas stimulation for recovering the gas from tight formations."

Be that as it may, the AEC announced last month that it is putting up $1 million to test a technique known as massive hydraulic fracturing—essentially pumping high pressure fluids down a borehole to fracture the gas bearing rock—at a site a mile away from Rio Blanco.

Law Suit Challenges Academy Committee Secrecy

The National Academy of Sciences' tradition of performing most of its government advisory work in mole-like secrecy is under challenge in a lawsuit filed by an independent, Nader-style organization known as the Public Interest Campaign.

The suit, filed March 15 in the US District Court of the District of Columbia, is specifically aimed at acquiring the records and opening up the proceedings of the Academy's Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions, which is under contract to advise the Environmental Protection Agency on enforcement of the Clean Air Act. However, if successful, the suit could have a devastating effect on the Academy's operating style, which is predicated on the assumption that candor thrives in secrecy and that, therefore, specialists who are summoned to help the Academy fulfill its congressionally chartered role of adviser to the federal government should meet in private.

The challenge to the Academy is based on the Freedom of Information Act and the closely linked Federal Advisory Committee Act, which together were intended to let the public in on the operations of the Executive Branch by severely limiting the grounds for both holding back federal documents and closing advisory meetings to the public. The two measures are a long way from converting government to a fishbowl operation, but they have provided levers for prying loose a good deal of information that previously was arbitrarily withheld. The Academy has not yet formally replied to the suit, but on the basis of past attempts to open it up, it can be expected to contend that, though Congressionally chartered and deep in government work, it is a private organization and as a consequence is outside the scope of both acts.

The legalities are actually a bit fuzzy. Though the boundries between public and private have been greatly eroded in many American institutions, the Academy has most of the traditional attributes of a private organization, even though it is so tightly linked to the federal government that it is included in the *Congressional Directory's* list of federal agencies and until recently was entered in the Washington, D.C., telephone directory under US Government. Nevertheless, it is privately chartered, elects its own officers, and receives no direct appropriation from the Congress; rather, its government funds are received under contract from federal agencies. Furthermore, though the Federal Advisory Committee Act does not explicitly exclude the Academy from its provisions, it was stated during House floor debate that it was not intended that the measure apply to the Academy or organizations working for the government on contract.

Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee Act provides some support for the contention that advisory operations such as those conducted by the Academy are within its scope. Thus, the Act states that "The term 'advisory committee' means any committee, board, commission, council, conference, panel, task force, or other similar group. . . .established or utilized by one or more agencies, in the interest of obtaining advice or recommendations for the President or one or more agencies or officers of the Federal Government. . . ."

Before taking legal action, the president of Public Interest Campaign, Louis V. Lombardo, asked Academy President Philip Handler for a formal opinion on the applicability of the Advisory Committee Act to the proceedings of the Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions.

A reply was furnished by the Academy's executive officer, John S. Coleman, who piously asserted, "That the Academy is able to obtain (privileged) information depends on large measure upon its unquestioned integrity, independence and objectivity. In itself, this ability is a valuable resource to the federal government. The application of the regulatory provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act to the deliberations of the Academy Committees could seriously compromise this independence and objectivity."

NIMH Puts Restrictions On Psychosurgery Support

The federal government's long-awaited guidelines governing the use of psychosurgery to control "abnormal" behavior are now undergoing final review in the top echelons of HEW, having been drawn up by staff members of the National Institute of Mental Health.

As set out in a memorandum signed by NIMH director Bert Brown and sent to Assistant Secretary for Health Charles C. Edwards, the proposed guidelines would prevent federal aid from being used to support the most controversial applications of psychosurgery—those operations performed on children, prisoners and mental patients detained in institutions against their will—but they would stop well short of calling for a flat ban on the irreversible behavior modification technique.

Since psychosurgery has generally been performed with hopelessly inadequate experimental controls, there's a great division of opinion whether or not it even works as its proponents claim, and until such basic disagreements can be resolved, NIMH is proposing that the technique should be re-

(Continued on page 6.)

Letter to the Editor

Forest Service Denies Lag on DDT Replacement

Dear Sir:

In discussing the recent decision by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to allow emergency use of DDT, if needed, to control the tussock moth in forests of the Pacific Northwest, SGR (Vol. IV, No. 6) concludes that alternative means of control had been ignored until last year.

Both the writer of the article and EPA Administrator Russell Train are wrong in this conclusion. A major effort to find alternatives to DDT for controlling the tussock moth has been underway since 1964—8 years before the ban on DDT by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Research goals in finding these alternate controls have not yet succeeded, partly because of the long time period between outbreaks (when it was difficult to find even low-level populations for study and testing) and partly because research funding has been limited.

But significant progress has been made and I cite the following facts to rebut the article's contention that it wasn't until last summer "that the Forest Service did any serious research and testing of alternatives to DDT to control the pest."

1. In 1964 we began to investigate the use of natural biological agents to control the moth. Through this investigation, many of the natural parasites, predators and diseases which attack the moth have been identified. One of these—a nucleopolyhedrosis virus—shows exceptional promise. The virus achieved population reductions as high as 99 percent when sprayed on small plots last year. A commercially available bacterium (Bacillus thuringiensis) was also tested in 1973. It achieved population reductions as high as 98 percent. But some research problems still remain. . .

2. In 1966, the Forest Service began initial screening of insecticides against the tussock moth at its Insecticide Evaluation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif. Of the 80 compounds tested so far, half show significant toxicity to the moth larvae. But until the 1972 outbreak in eastern Oregon and Washington in 1972, there had not been a significant outbreak on which these insecticides could be tested. In 1972, Zectran was tested against the tussock moth in Washington and Oregon. In 1973, it and three others of the most promising insecticides—carbaryl, Dylox and bioethanomethrin (a synthetic pyrethrin) were tested in the Wallowa and Blue mountains in Oregon. The field test for Zectran covered more than 70,000 acres, but it proved only moderately encouraging. Consequently, this year more extensive tests will be conducted with carbaryl and Dylox. As you know, it is impossible to complete a field testing program in one or two years.

3. Because of the need to know about the biology of the moth, we have been devoting much of our research effort over the years to studies of insect population trends and ecology, population genetics and behavior, relationship of weather to outbreaks, and tree physiology.

4. These tangible research activities, plus the fact the Forest Service spent $370,000 last year and is spending over $600,000 this year on research for safer controls, I think, belies Mr. Train's statement that efforts to date have been "almost totally inadequate—to the point of dereliction."

It is disappointing that a scientific publication such as yours failed to obtain the facts relating to Forest Service research for alternatives to DDT before erroneously reporting that no serious efforts were undertaken until last summer.

JOHN R. McGUIRE
Chief, Forest Service,
US Department of Agriculture

PSYCHOSURGERY *(Continued from page 5.)*

garded as strictly experimental, to be used only in rare circumstances, when all else has failed.

The effect of such a classification would be to slap a number of restrictions on when and how psychosurgery should be performed. For a start, the proposed guidelines suggest that such operations should be carried out only in hospitals which have "strong and intimate affiliation with, and attachment to, academic sciences," and comprehensive research protocols would have to be drawn up for each operation. Strict controls would have to be applied to make sure that informed consent is freely given, and "every effort must be made to ensure that all reasonable alternative therapies are attempted before resorting to psychosurgery."

When they finally emerge, the new regulations will legally apply only to the use of federal funds for psychosurgery, but they are likely to have an impact on non-federal programs as well because they are expected to be copied at the state level, which means that they will apply to a wide range of medical and research institutions.

Joint Atomic Committee Fights for Energy Role

There's probably no institution more prone to turf fighting and jurisdictional blood feuds than the US Congress, and a good example of bloodletting is about to emerge over the Bolling Committee's proposals for revamping the committee structure of the House of Representatives (SGR Vol. III, No. 22).

Although Wilbur Mills, the powerful Arkansas Democrat, is likely to be in the front line, protecting the authority of his Ways and Means Committee, which would be decimated by the Bolling proposals, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (JCAE) is the first off the mark with a counter proposal to extend, rather than diminish, its jurisdictional patch.

The Bolling proposals would designate the House Committee on Science and Astronautics as the preeminent committee on energy research and development, which means that it would handle some bills that are now the exclusive prerogative of the JCAE. Although the Bolling proposals say nothing about the JCAE as such—being partly a committee of the Senate, the Joint Committee is outside the purview of proposals for revamping committees of the House—the effect of the changes, if they are implemented, would clearly be to clip its wings.

Believing that the best means of defense is attack, the two senior Senate members of the JCAE, John Pastore (D-R.I.) and George Aiken (R-Vt), and House member Rep. Orval Hansen (D-Idaho) have introduced bills into their respective legislative chambers which would extend the committee's jurisdiction to cover not just atomic energy, but all aspects of energy research and development. The committee would be renamed the Joint Committee on Energy, and its membership would be increased from 18 to 28.

The Joint Committee is already about to be weakened because its two most senior House members, Chet Holifield (D-Calif) and Craig Hosmer (R-Calif), are leaving Congress after long stints at the helm of the federal government's nuclear energy policies, and there is considerable sentiment in Congress for setting up a new legislative structure to handle the slew of legislation that all Congressmen are now duty bound to purpose.

But, in the dim past, when environmental protection was all the rage, there were plenty of calls for new Congressional arrangements for dealing with that topic, so why should the energy crisis be more effective in bringing about changes in the Congressional committee structure?

One reason is that Congress is moving along with a proposal to set up an Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) by bringing together most of the energy research programs of the federal government into a single agency organized around the laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission. Although the Administration, which strongly supports the ERDA proposal, has made great play of the fact that it wouldn't require any change in the Congressional committee structure, ERDA would come under the purview of about eight committees.

So the Joint Committee has seized its chance and proposed that ERDA should come under the jurisdiction of only one committee—the Joint Committee on Energy.

But the proposal has already fallen afoul of Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash), the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, who has carved out a place for himself as Capitol Hill's most prominent spokesman on energy matters—mostly by riding roughshod over other committee jurisdictions. Jackson said in a Senate speech that energy policy is too complex a matter to be left to a single committee. The proposal would also rob him of a major advantage in his quest for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976.

In any case, nothing is likely to happen to the proposal until Congress has disposed of the ERDA legislation. Although the prospects are now bright for Senate passage of the bill, which passed the House in December, it's going to take some time to tie up the loose ends.

In the meantime, if the House of Representatives agrees on the Bolling proposals—or even just on those of them that deal with energy matters—the Joint Committee's pitch for more power would be preempted. The House is the sole master of its own internal structure, and so if it agreed that energy research and development bills should be sent to the Science and Astronautics Committee that's where they will go, no matter what happens to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription
☐ Enter my subscription

for one year, $44 ☐ ; two years, $80 ☐
(Overseas airmail, $10 additional per year.)
☐ check enclosed; ☐ please bill.

☐ Send a complimentary copy to:

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

CEQ Chief Hits Industry For Energy Scare Ads

Russell Peterson, the new chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, has got himself into a public scrap with executives of the American Electric Power Company, the largest investor-owned utility in the country, with Peterson accusing AEP of irresponsible and nonsensical advertising, and AEP's chairman firing off a letter to President Nixon suggesting that he should investigate Peterson's "conduct of his office."

The conflict started when Peterson, incensed by a series of full-page ads taken out by AEP in national news publications which suggested that energy conservation will "generate galloping unemployment," wrote to AEP president George Patterson, calling such a suggestion "the least comprehending of our energy problem and the most subversive of the public interest." Peterson also made his letter public.

Donald C. Cook, AEP's chairman, replied to Peterson with a vituperative attack in which he failed to defend the advertising campaign but suggested that Peterson was trying to take away AEP's "right of free speech and thereby preventing the dissemination of the truth about the inevitable consequences of your extremism." Peterson's crime is that he has publicly advocated that the United States should cut its growth in energy consumption by half.

Cook was particularly concerned that Peterson had made his original letter public, but CEQ officials point out that it was the only way to make their case known. Since AEP's advertising campaign probably cost more than CEQ's entire budget, CEQ could hardly respond in kind to the advertisements' self-interested rubbish.

Technology Transfer Hearings

The well-worn theme of the transfer of technology from the United States to developing countries is about to get another airing on Capitol Hill through a bill introduced in the House by Richard T. Hanna, a lame-duck (through voluntary retirement) Congressman from California.

Since Congress is likely to be hung up on impeachment in the next few months, the bill isn't going to get anywhere, but Hanna, who happens to be chairman of a subcommittee on international scientific affairs, is planning some hearings on the matter next month.

The nub of his proposal is the establishment of an International Institute for Technology Transfer, a kind of international data bank staffed by scientists, which will supply information to underdeveloped countries on request. Hanna has the novel idea that the Institute would use leased satellite telecommunication lines, though he is not too specific about why such speed would be required to get information across.

Hanna claims that he's getting a favorable reception for the idea from the Administration, but since Nixon and his associates are not currently disposed to avoidable squabbles with Congress, the good reception, such as it may be, can probably be written off as a tactical courtesy.

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT, © 1974 by Science & Government Report, Inc. All rights reserved. Daniel S. Greenberg, Editor and Publisher; Colin Norman, Contributing Editor; Margot Daffron, Circulation Manager. Published 22 times per year at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015. Subscription rate, $44 a year; overseas airmail subscription, $54. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Vol. IV, No. 8, April 15, 1974.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

NEWSLETTER—
Please expedite delivery directly to addressee

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

Xerox Univ Microfilms
300 N Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106